UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/695,848	10/29/2003	Bozidar Ferek-Petric	P0010438.01	7829	
27581 MEDTRONIC,	590 01/29/2009 INC.	l	EXAMINER		
710 MEDTRON	NIC PARKWAY NE		MEHTA, BHISMA		
WIINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55432-9924		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3767		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/29/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/695,848	FEREK-PETRIC, BOZIDAR		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BHISMA MEHTA	3767		

	BHISMA MEHTA	3767	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ster than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 			ne issues for
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 46-48,50-52,54-59 and 61. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an ex	xplanation of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (ered but does NOT place the applic		
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.	1 10/30/00/1 apel 110(5)		
/Kevin C. Sirmons/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767	/Bhisma Mehta/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767		

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments in lines 11-26 of page 6 have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. Both Whitehurst et al and Houben et al disclose treating a patient by delivering an electrical pulse to the patient to produce an electrical field. Houben et al teach that it is well known to monitor cardiac activity when delivering an electrical pulse that generates an electric field where the qRs complex from an electrocardiogram is detected and synchronized with the delivery of the electrical pulse (see abstract, lines 42-61 of column 2, and line 52 of column 4 to line 2 of column 6). Since Houben et al teach that it is well known to monitor a patient's heart during the delivery of electrical pulse such that the delivery of the electrical pulses can be synchronized with the qRs complex to reduce cardiac interference, it would be obvious to apply the detecting and synchronizing step of Houben et al to the method of Whitehurst et al. Furthermore, in lines 5-35 of column 21, Whitehurst et al also teach using multiple sensors to monitor the state of the patient during the delivery of the electrical pulses to the patient and this indicates that Whitehurst et al disclose sensing the response of the patient's body due to the application of the electrical pulses. Thus, one would be motivated to apply the detecting and synchronizing steps of Houben et al to the method of Whitehurst et al as both Whitehurst et al and Houben et al disclose monitoring the state of the patient while the electrical pulses are being delivered.

Additionally, Applicant's remarks in lines 19-23 of page 6 are unclear as it does not appear that the claimed method is drawn to the specifics of the tumor, to which the electrical pulse are being applied, being sensed.

Continuation of 13. Other: The objection to claims 46-48, 50-52, and 54-56 has been overcome by the amendment to claim 46 filed January 5 2009.